

**From:** KarenD Johnson/R3/USEPA/US  
**Sent:** 1/31/2012 7:26:37 PM  
**To:** Jon Capacasa  
**CC:**  
**Subject:** Re: Fw: Cabot Challenges EPA's Dimock Water Data

We did select the high values and many of the homes had not had any sampling done since December 2010, because Cabot indicated the residents "refused" to allow Cabot to sample, but the residents said they came when they were not at home and didn't make arrangements to sample. **Ex. 5 - Deliberative** there are no results for some of those homes in the past year, but some of the results in the test America data did include metals and they were not significantly different than the "highest value" we pulled from the DEP data tables.

Some of the results were from "post treatment" the sodium, or "provided" water one arsenic sample, but the data was confusing because it said it was post treatment and the only treatment was "methane removal", specifically at the **Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy** also indicated that Cabot changed all the filters before taking their samples and their post treatment levels of most metals were above the pretreatment results so it was a mess. to interpret.

Their comments also don't address the DEHP and the other semi-volatile organic results their lab identified, but never reported to DEP. Nor does it acknowledge that the "background" or "naturally occurring" metals are naturally occurring thousands of feet below the surface, not in the pre-drilling results or documented results from sampling pre-drilling in the area.

There are state geology reports that have many samples from wells in the specific area of Carter road for the metals constituents in the 1970's and 1980's showing that these levels of metals were not present in the wells, including the arsenic along Carter and Meshopen Creek Roads. I'm going through a document tonight that has well samples from 4-5 wells that will represent background- pre-drilling and that **Ex. 5 - Deliberative** gathered in 2008. Iron and Aluminum <.005 same for arsenic. They are the ones cherry-picking data. We basically saw one set of organics data that they got, and never submitted, that has the majority of the chemicals of concern. And the metals they reportedly say are background are definitely not from surface deposits.

Karen D. Johnson, Chief

Ground Water & Enforcement Branch

-----Jon Capacasa/R3/USEPA/US wrote: -----

To: "William Arguto" <Arguto.William@epamail.epa.gov>, "Karen D Johnson" <johnson.karenD@epa.gov>

From: Jon Capacasa/R3/USEPA/US

Date: 01/31/2012 06:04PM

Subject: Fw: Cabot Challenges EPA's Dimock Water Data

We need to assess Cabots assertion about a Montrose PA

**From:** Shawn Garvin

**Sent:** 01/31/2012 05:39 PM EST

**To:** Terri-A White; "Betsaida Alcantara" <alcantara.betsaida@epa.gov>; Dennis Carney; Jon Capacasa; Victoria Binetti; William Early

**Cc:** Ron Borsellino; "Mick Kulik" <kulik.michael@epa.gov>; "Dandrea Michael" <dandrea.michael@epa.gov>; Daniel Ryan; Kathy Hodgkiss; Bob Sussman; Amy Johansen

**Subject:** Re: Cabot Challenges EPA's Dimock Water Data

Terri - We need to get a quick response to this

**Ex. 5 - Deliberative**

Thank you - Shawn

**From:** Terri-A White

**Sent:** 01/31/2012 04:03 PM EST

**To:** Shawn Garvin; "Betsaida Alcantara" <alcantara.betsaida@epa.gov>

**Cc:** Ron Borsellino; "Mick Kulik" <kulik.michael@epa.gov>

**Subject:** Fw: Cabot Challenges EPA's Dimock Water Data

Fyi

Sent by EPA Wireless E-Mail Services

**From:** "Maykuth, Andy" [amaykuth@phillynews.com]

**Sent:** 01/31/2012 03:56 PM EST

**To:** Terri-A White

**Subject:** FW: Cabot Challenges EPA's Dimock Water Data

Terri:

Can EPA comment on this statement that Cabot put out on its website today? Cabot says it has gone back and studied the test results that were available to EPA from Dimock and alleges that EPA cherry-picked data from Dimock wells, and that some of the data, including the arsenic number, is not actually from a resident's drinking water.

Said Cabot spokesman George Stark:

As you are aware Cabot disagrees with EPA's decision to conduct an extensive investigation and to provide water to a select group of landowners on the grounds there is no evidence the well water in question poses a threat to human health. EPA's data points are out of context, not representative of the volumes of data collected, and in some cases, did not originate from these residences' water wells at all. We desire to set the record straight on the relevance of the data and where it came from.

This from Cabot's email:

These distortions of fact are summarized below:

- The U.S. EPA disregarded more recent data that better demonstrates the current conditions of the water wells. Instead, they opted to utilize data from several years ago, including one from November 2008. Less than a handful of the data utilized was collected in 2011.
- NONE of the data points selected by the U.S. EPA show concentrations for substances (including arsenic, manganese, sodium, glycols and DEHP) in the residences' well water that exceed the Primary Maximum Contaminant Levels set by the U.S. Government.
- The water sample cited by the U.S. EPA to represent the maximum concentration of arsenic in the Carter water well was NOT taken from the residence's water well – it was from a sample of the Montrose area public water supply from Pennsylvania American Water. All other arsenic values for the Carter water well fall below the PMCL.
- Many of the data points selected are taken out of context:
  - o The sodium point for the Sautner well water was taken from a post-treatment water sample after having gone through a water softener, which reduces water hardness by replacing calcium and magnesium with sodium and thereby raising the overall sodium concentration. A review of the data shows, as expected, that all of the pre-treatment water samples have sodium concentrations 3-4 times lower than the post-treatment water.
  - o The manganese point for the Sautner well water is nearly three years old and was only one of two samples to be above the Secondary Contaminant Level. The other 43 water samples collected were below this level. Realize there is not PMCL for manganese, only a SMCL.
  - o The sodium point for the Nolan Ely water well was collected 18 months ago and is inconsistent with data collected since September 2010.
- The Montrose area public water supplied by Pennsylvania American water (which the EPA is currently providing to these residences) contains sodium concentrations well above what the majority of the landowners have in their own water wells.
- There is neither a Primary Maximum Contaminant Level nor a Secondary Contaminant Level established for sodium.
- The manganese levels in the four water wells fall within the levels of naturally occurring manganese observed throughout the Susquehanna County area.
- The glycol levels are well below the ATSDR advisory level referenced by the U.S. EPA.

Also, I need a brief update on where your work in Dimock stands. Conducting tests yet?

My deadline is today.

Andrew Maykuth | Business News Writer

The Philadelphia Inquirer | 400 North Broad St. | Philadelphia, PA 19118

Phone: 215-854-2947 | Cell: 267-975-6877 | amaykuth@phillynews.com | <http://twitter.com/maykuth>